## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of September 11, 2006 and the disclosures of Cospen et al '014 and Brifcani et al '634 have been carefully reviewed along with the disclosures of other cited references, and applicant is replacing the previous claims 1-31 with new claims 32-39 to distinguish applicant's can shell disclosed in connection with FIGS. 7 & 8 more clearly and specifically from the prior art and to place these claims in condition for allowance.

In reference to new claim 32, applicant's shell includes a circular center panel (12') connected by a panel wall (16') to an inner wall portion (17') of a countersink (18') having an outer wall portion (24') and a generally U-shaped cross-sectional configuration, a chuckwall having a lower wall portion (34') connected to the outer wall portion of the countersink and an upper wall portion (32') connected to an inner wall portion (38') of the crown (42'), the upper wall portion of the chuckwall forming an angular break (35') with the lower wall portion of the chuckwall, the upper wall portion (35') of the chuckwall having opposite end points defining in axial cross-section with the center axis a first angle (A2) substantially greater than a second angle (A3) defined by opposite end points in axial cross-section of the lower wall portion (34') of the chuckwall with the center axis, the inner wall portion (38') of the crown forming an angular junction (46') with the upper wall portion (32') of the chuckwall and extending from the junction at a third angle (A4) in axial cross-section with the center axis substantially less than the first angle (A2), and the second angle (A3) of said lower wall portion (34') of said chuckwall being greater than ten degrees.

Applicant has found that the above cross-sectional configuration or profile of his can shell is highly desirable in not only reducing the diameter of the blank which forms the can shell but also in significantly increasing the buckle strength of the can shell after it is double-seamed to the can body and subjected to the various pressure and drop tests commonly used to test a pressurized can after it has received a beverage which develops pressure. On the other hand, applicant is unable to find any suggestion or teaching in Cospen et al '014 or Brifcani et al '634 or in any of the other references of a can shell having the specific cross-sectional configuration set forth above in new claim 32. For example, the can shell disclosed

in FIGS. 1 & 2 of Cospen et al '014 has a generally vertical chuckwall with a short inclined intermediate portion and a lower portion extending at a few degrees, and does not suggest the relative angles and dimensions set forth above in new claim 32. The can end disclosed in Brifcani et al '634 has a frusto-conical chuckwall which is straight in axial cross-section from the crown or double-seam to the vertical outer wall of the countersink. Thus even when these references are combined, the references fail to suggest or teach applicant's can shell with the specific cross-sectional profile set forth above in new claim 32.

The above comments also apply to new claim 36 which includes the above structure of claim 32 and also to claims 33-35 and 37-39 which depend from claims 32 and 36. Furthermore, the references neither disclose nor suggest a can shell wherein the upper wall portion (32') of the chuckwall projecting substantially above the center panel (12') both before and after the crown (42') is double-seamed (FIG. 8) to the can body (50'), the upper wall portion of the chuckwall having a horizontal radial width from the junction (46') to the break (35') greater than a horizontal radial width (W1) of the countersink at the bottom of the countersink between the inner and outer walls of the countersink, and a straight line distance between the opposite end points of the upper wall portion (32') also being greater than the horizontal radial width of the countersink at the bottom of the countersink, as included in new claim 36.

The references also fail to teach a can shell with a horizontal radial width of the upper wall portion (32') of the chuckwall being greater than a radial width between the break (35') and the inner wall of the countersink at the bottom of the countersink, as set forth in new dependent claims 33 and 37, or wherein an upper wall portion (32') of the chuckwall is substantially straight in axial cross-section from the break (35') to the junction (46'), and the junction is located substantially above the center panel (12') both before and after the shell is double-seamed to the can body, as called for in new claims 34 and 38, or wherein the lower wall portion (34') of the chuckwall is substantially straight in axial cross-section and extends at an angle of about 15° relative to the center axis, as recited in new claims 35 and 39.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully submits that each of new independent claims 32 and 36 and dependent claims 33-35 and 37-39 defines a

specific can shell cross-sectional configuration or profile which is clearly distinguished from the disclosures of Cospen et al '014 and Brifcani et al '634 and the other cited references, and which provides very desirable advantages to the can industry. Accordingly, applicant believes that these claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
JACOX, MECKSTROTH & JENKINS

Alan F. Meckstroth
Reg. No. 22,607
Tel.: (937) 298-2811

AFM:pm/js